DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 353 CS 206 862

AUTHOR Zaharias, Jane Ann
TITLE An Exploratory Investigation into the Nature of Literary Response.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 32p.; Research prepared at The Ohio State University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Style; College Students; *Educational Research; *English Instruction; Higher Education; *Literature Appreciation; Reading Achievement; Responses; Sex Differences; *Student Reaction
IDENTIFIERS *Literary Response

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted (1) to examine the effects of the same reading materials on different individuals and the effects of different reading materials on the same person and (2) to explore whether an individual's preferred pattern of response to a literary selection was related to differences in sex, reading ability, and learning style. Subjects were 166 college students in nine sections of introductory literary courses, who read three poems and three short stories, selected for their diversity in structure, form, and content and then completed a variety of measures designed to determine the status of each with respect to the variables of reading ability, learning style preference, preferred pattern of literary response, and sex. Differences in response were found to be a function of textual variation. No complex relationships were observed among response, sex, reading ability, and learning style preference. The findings also contradicted previous research showing that high school students have a consistent way of responding to the literature they encountered. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216353

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

An Exploratory Investigation into the Nature of Literary Response

Jane Ann Zaharias

The Ohio State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane Ann Zaharias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Current address: 8804 McCracken Rd.
Garfield Hts.,
Ohio 44125

Position: Visiting Instructor
Department of Specialized
Instructional Programs
Cleveland State University

Telephone: (216) 687-4585 - work
(216) 581-3907 - home

CS206862

An Exploratory Investigation into the Nature of Literary Response

Most research on literary response can be characterized as looking for either universal patterns of response or specific reader traits and approaches to literature instruction that are consistently related to students' preferred ways of responding to literature. In general, these efforts have been only marginally successful. It is recognized that this lack of success is due, in part, to the absence of valid and reliable instruments for assessing response (Cooper & Michalak, 1981, pp. 163-169); and to the failure of many investigators to attend to the methodological, statistical, and conceptual difficulties which beset this type of inquiry (Applebee, 1977, p. 264). Moreover, the elusive and complex nature of response itself (Purves, 1973, p. 36), has served as a legitimate and pragmatic determinant to the depth and scope of previous investigations. These limitations have led to inconsistencies in definition, in the manner in which response has been measured, and in findings among researchers; so that, today, little concrete information exists that can function as a foundation for additional study. To overcome these shortcomings, research needs to be conducted to provide a reliable, valid, measurable, low-inference definition of response.

Recently, this research goal was adopted by the author of this report. Specifically, the high-inference reader behavior, literary response, was subjected to empirical study. The purpose of this program of research was:

1. To provide a valid and reliable operational definition of reader response by determining its low-inference constituents.
2. To provide a tentative mapping of the relationships among selected reader characteristics and the low-inference response constituents, and
3. To explore the manner in which textual variation influences response.

The significance of this study resides in the fact that it is guided by a theoretical model for research in reader response recently proposed by Purves (1979, pp. 802-812). Purves' model suggests that response is the result of a series of complex interactions between the reader, the author, and the text. It recognizes that response may be shared and personal, and it identifies three possible sources of variation in response: differences among texts, among readers, and among the contexts in which response is expressed. In addition, Purves' model is responsive to theories of criticism and literature, as well as, to the practice of readers and critics. It seeks to account, "for the elements common to the responses of large groups as well

as for individual differences" (p. 803). This model, then, attempts to reconcile the tension which exists between centrality and diversity in literary response. With respect to his model, Purves writes:

> One cannot examine variation except in reference to central tendency; one cannot regard the individual except in relation to the group, nor the group except in relation to the individual. One response by one reader to one text in one situation tells us little; it is an isomorph. There must be a second response, a second person, a second text, a second situation -- even a third -- in order for a pattern to emerge. It has become fashionable of late to do the case study; the glamour of the anthropologist or the psychiatrist has replaced that of the sociologist. But the case study of a reader is only effective when it is performed against a larger backdrop of many readers. The backdrop only comes to make sense when it is tested against the individual case. (p. 812)

With Purves' model in mind, the present study was designed to examine the effects of the same reading material on different individuals and the effects of different reading material on the same person. Second, it will endeavor to examine whether an individual's preferred pattern of response is related to differences in sex and reading ability. Finally, within the context of the literature classroom, this investigation will attempt to ascertain whether learning style preference is related to response.

Method

Student sample. The sample for this study consisted of

166 (male = 82, female = 84) undergraduate students enrolled in introductory literature courses offered by the Department of English, an academic faculty housed within the College of Arts and Sciences at The XXX XXX University's main campus in XXX, XXX. To enhance the potential for obtaining the maximum range of literary response, undergraduate college students were sampled since the findings of previous investigations indicate that there are developmental constraints on literary response (Applebee, 1978, p. 132).

English Departmental approval for this investigation was obtained and listings of faculty teaching assignments for the Spring, Summer, and Autumn Quarters of 1981 were secured. A letter detailing the objectives and procedures of this investigation was then sent to all faculty members assigned to teach 100 and 200 level introductory literature courses during the aforementioned quarters. Enclosed with the letter was a copy of the prospectus for this study and a response sheet on which the faculty members were instructed to indicate whether they were willing to have their class participate in this investigation. To facilitate the return of the response sheet, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was included in each information packet. These packets were mailed two weeks prior to the beginning of each quarter in which data were collected. Two weeks subsequent to the initial mailing, those instructors who had not returned

their response sheet were sent a follow-up letter. Of the 38 faculty members contacted in this manner, 28 replied; but only nine instructors indicated a willingness to have their classes participate. Students enrolled in these nine class were approached as potential subjects. Because so much time was needed to complete the three instruments, approximately five to six hours, six of the instructors offered their students extra credit as an inducement for participation.

The sample, therefore, may be characterized as voluntary or self-elected. Because the subjects in this investigation do not constitute a random sample, results are not generalizable to the total population of undergraduates enrolled in introductory literature courses at The XXX XXX University or any other institution of higher education.

Although 208 students indicated their willingness to participate in this study, as evidenced by their signatures on a consent form and their completion of one or more of the measures, only 166 students submitted a complete set of useable instruments.

Educationally, approximately 10% of the students were freshmen; 39% were sophmores; 24% were juniors; 23% were seniors; and the remaining 4% were students enrolled in the continuing education program offered by The XXX XXX University.

As previously mentioned, the sample contained students from nine classes. These classes were taught by different

instructors and represent four courses offered by the Department of English. All are 200 level offerings and are taken for five credit hours. With respect to these courses, approximately 8% of the students were enrolled in a poetry course; 52% in a fiction course; 31% in a science fiction course; and 8% in a American literature course.

On a nationally standardized reading test (Educational Testing Service, 1969) administered to all subjects within the course of this investigation, the nine classes obtained an average converted score of 481, with a standard deviation of 7.94 (normed mean 476, SD 13).

Instrumentation. Students participating in this study were asked to respond to a variety of instruments. These measures were selected in an effort to determine the status of each subject with respect to the variables of sex, reading ability, learning style preference, and preferred pattern of literary response.

To assess reading achievement, each participant was administered the reading comprehension section of the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress, Series II, Form 1A achievement battery, (Educational Testing Service, 1969). This widely used, well-researched standardized reading achievement test purports to measure a student's ability to read and understand a variety of materials. The sentences and passages that form the stimulus include stories, poems, and selections from the literature of the sciences, social

studies, and humanities. Form 1A, appropriate for use with college students, consists of two separately timed parts which yield a single raw score. Part I contains both literal and inferential multiple choice sentence comprehension items. Part II contains six passages of varying lengths, each followed by several multiple choice items. The reading skills required of the student focus on the main idea of the passage, supporting details, direct and intended inference, application, evaluation of logic, and style and tone. The entire measure takes approximately one hour to administer.

To assess learning style preferences, each subject was asked to complete a Learning Styles Inventory (Canfield, 1976). This instrument was chosen on the basis of its broad coverage of learning styles, high reliability, appropriateness for a college audience, and the relatively limited amount of time (approximately 20 minutes) required for its administration. Scores for the instrument's subscales, rather than single item scores, were used in subsequent analysis.

The Learning Styles Inventory (LSI) is organized into four scales. The first scale, Conditions of Learning, consists of eight subscales or variables that reflect a student's concern for the dynamics of the situation in which learning occurs. The second scale, Content of Learning, contains four variables related to a student's major area of

interest. The third scale, Mode of Learning, provides information regarding the student's preferred modality; while the fourth scale, Expectations for Learning, purports to measure a student's anticipated level of academic performance. To produce a variable or subscale score, a student responds to six items by ranking four supplied choices in order of personal preference (e.g., 1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred). The rankings of specified choices are then summed across items to produce a variable score.

To assess expressed patterns of literary response, a stimulus condition consisting of the following three poems and three short stories was devised: e. e. cummings' "in Just--," Robert Frost's "'Out, Out--'," Edwin Arlington Robinson's "Richard Cory," Shirley Jackson's "After You, My Dear Alphonse," Dorothy Parker's "But the One on the Right," and John Updike's "How to Love America and Leave it at the Same Time." These literary works were selected for their diversity in structure, form, and content. An additional criterion for selection was length. Each work is short enough that it can be read in one sitting. This was deemed necessary because of the possible extraneous effects which might influence responses to the preference inventories should the reader not be able to complete each story/poem without interruption.

After reading each literary work, subjects were asked to complete the form of the Response Preference Inventory (RPI) associated with the poem or short story they had just completed. The 20 item RPI has been used and extensively described in two previous investigations (Purves, 1973; 1981). To eliminate the problem associated with the unequal distribution of the 20 items across the four major categories of response (Cooper & Michalak, 1981, pp. 164-165) defined by Purves and Rippere (1968, pp. 5-8), the RPI was modified for use in this investigation. While the items on the instrument have, for the most part remained unaltered, the format of the measure was revised to create a Likert-type scale. Instead of selecting five items, participants in this study were asked to rate the value of each of the 20 items as they related to the six aforementioned literary works (i.e., 1 = This question is very important to my understanding of the story/poem, 5 = This question is very unimportant to my understanding of the story/poem). The Likert scaling technique eliminated problems which have resulted from the unequal distribution of items among response categories and it made the factor analysis of data possible, thereby, permitting this researcher to report results in terms of categories or factors which have been determined empirically rather than relying on the Purves-Rippere groupings which are at best arbitrary (Applebee, 1977, p. 263).

To control for the possible effects of item placement, the 20 items on the RPI were randomly assigned positions within each form of the inventory. When assembling the packets of the RPI measures, the six parallel forms of the inventory, along with their respective literary works, were randomly distributed within packages to control for potential extraneous effects which might be attributed to the order in which the subjects read the literary selections.

Prior to administration of the RPI, the measure was piloted with a group of 14 undergraduates enrolled in a 100 level English course. Results of this pilot study indicated a need for the addition of an "undecided" category to balance the range of choices on the Likert scale. The results also suggested that the literary works were unfamiliar to most students, since only two individuals reported having previously read any of the materials. In both of these instances, "Richard Cory" was cited as the familiar work.

Procedures. The researcher met twice with students in each of the nine participating classes. The purpose of the initial visit was to explain the nature of the investigation to students and to encourage their participation in the study. Volunteers were then asked to sign a consent form and to complete the LSI. Subsequent to the administration of the LSI, packets containing the six literary selections

and the six forms of the RPI were randomly distributed to subjects. The researcher then reviewed the instructions accompanying the RPI packet and told participants that they would be required to complete these measures independently. One week after the first visit, the researcher again met with each class for the purpose of collecting the completed RPI's and administering the reading achievement test.

Overview of the analyses. To accomplish the goals of this investigation, the following analyses were performed:

1. To empirically determine the intermediate dimensions of literary response, principal-axis factor analysis, rotated to a varimax solution, was performed on response preference data.
2. To explore multivariate relationships among selected student characteristics and literary response, factor scores were generated for each of the 166 participants on the basis of their responses to the six forms of the RPI. These scores were then canonically related to the variables of sex, reading ability, and learning style preference.
3. To examine the manner in which textual variation influences literary response, a one-factor repeated measure MANOVA was performed and univariate ANOVA's, followed-up by Tukey's

HSD procedure, were conducted for each of the initial twenty response preference variables as represented by the items on the RPI.

Results

Constituent structure of literary response. To empirically determine the constituent dimensions or factors represented by the 20 items on the RPI, participants' ratings for each item on all six forms of the inventory were jointly subjected to the principal-axis method of common factor analysis by means of the SAS computer procedure FACTOR (Sarle, 1979). To be sure to account for all meaningful factors in this data set, the 120-item correlation matrix was initially "overfactored" using squared multiple correlations as first estimates of the effective communalities. A 90 factor solution was thereby obtained and examined for the purpose of identifying the number of salient common factors to be retained for rotation. The criteria employed for determining the number of factors to be retained were (1) an examination of the eigenvalue magnitudes, (2) the application of Cattell's scree test (1966, p. 206), and (3) a careful examination of the size of loadings on the principal-axis factor matrix. Collectively, the results of these efforts suggested that four salient factors accounted for most of the common variance in the RPI data.

To achieve greater precision, the 120-item correlation matrix was refactored with the specification that the number of factors in the model be limited to four. These four factors were then subjected to an oblique promax rotation and an orthogonal varimax rotation. Examination of the resulting intercorrelation matrix revealed that factor correlations were low (r's < 0.19), suggesting the appropriateness of examining the results of the varimax rotation for the purpose of obtaining a meaningful factor structure. Table 1 displays the specific items that had a |0.300| or higher loading on each of the four response factors as they relate to the six literary works used in this study.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Subsequent to varimax rotation, the four factors were interpreted and labeled as follows:

FACTOR I: Personal Statement -- Responses directed at expressing one's feeling about the work in terms of one's relation to it.

FACTOR II: Descriptive Response -- Responses aimed at describing particular aspects of the work -- language, structure, literary form, etc.

FACTOR III: Evaluative Response -- Responses aimed at assessing the construction, meaningfulness, or appropriateness of the work.

FACTOR IV: Interpretive Response -- Responses directed at discovering the meaning

of parts of the work or the whole work in general.

Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for each of the these factors were then computed by means of the SPSS subprogram RELIABILITY (Specht & Bubolz, 1981). These coefficients, based on those variables with a |0.300| or higher loading on each of the four response factors follow: (1) Personal Statement, 0.90; (2) Descriptive Response, 0.89; (3) Evaluative Response, 0.87; and (4) Interpretive Response, 0.86.

Having established the factor structure, factor score estimates (based on ideal variables or the "least squares criterion") which conform to those described by Kim and Mueller (1978, p. 67) were generated for each of the 166 subjects on each of the four factors or response categories through use of the SOUPAC program FAC (Computing Services Office, 1976). Additionally, it should be noted that the results of the factor analysis obtained by means of the SOUPAC program were examined and compared with those of the varimax solution generated by the SAS procedure FACTOR. Since differences were slight, and did not effect the interpretation of the factors, the resulting scores were retained for use in subsequent analysis.

Multivariate relationships among selected reader characteristics and literary response. The second phase of this investigation sought to explore complex relationships which might exist among literary response and a number of

variables pertaining to reader characteristics. This objective was accomplished through the use of canonical variate analysis. For the purpose of this analysis, sex, reading ability, and the following selected learning style preference scores obtained from the LSI served as predictor variables: peer relationships, course organization, goal setting, competition, student/instructor relationships, detail, independence, and authority; interest in numeric content, qualitative content, inanimate content, and people oriented content; listening, reading, viewing, and direct experience modality preference; and overall anticipated level of academic performance. Whereas, the RPI factor scores functioned as criterion variables.

Canonical variate analysis takes into account the interdependencies among variables within data sets. This technique solves for a linear combination of criterion and predictor variables such that the correlation between respective canonical factor scores is maximized. The canonical analysis in this investigation was performed using the computer program CANON (Cooley & Lohnes, 1972). Results from this analysis are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Examination of the table reveals that there were no statistically significant pairs of canonical variates

associated with the analysis. In sum, these findings suggest that relationships among sex, reading ability, learning style preference, and literary response do not exist.

Textual variation and literary response. The final phase of this investigation focused on the effects of textual variation on patterns of response. To accomplish this objective, a one-factor repeated design multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on 20 dependent variables (items on the RPI), with literary selection functioning as the within-subjects treatment comparison. SAS computer procedure GLM (Goodnight, 1979) was used to accomplish this analysis.

Table 3 displays RPI item means and standard deviations by literary work and response category.

Insert Table 3 about here.

An examination of Table 3 tentatively suggested that students' patterns of response varied with respect to the selection they were reading. To test this observation, the six group centroids were compared by performing a MANOVA. The resultant Wilks' lambda of 0.2666 was highly significant ($F = 12.25$; df 100/3936, $p < 0.0001$), thus allowing for rejection of the null hypothesis of centroid equality.

To determine the nature of group differences relative to literary work, univariate ANOVA's were conducted on each response variable. Table 4 summarizes the results of these 20 univariate tests by literary selection.

Insert Table 4 about here.

As noted in the table, the Geisser-Greenhouse conservative F test was used to correct for positive bias in the resulting F statistics by reducing the conventional degrees of freedom to 1 and 165 (Kennedy, 1978, pp. 386-397). In all but two of the analyses, significance for the selection effect was still demonstrated using the conservative degrees of freedom. From a univariate perspective, then, the results of the ANOVA's, in conjunction with the group means presented in Table 3, clearly reveal that textual variation affects response.

Extensive interpretation and discussion of the post hoc analyses associated with the resulting significant ANOVA's is contained in the dissertation research of XXX (1982). Briefly, Tukey's HSD procedure was used for the purpose of comparing the means at each level of literary selection. The conservative posture adopted for the Geisser-Greenhouse F test was maintained in performing these analyses. That is, the conservative number of denominator degrees of freedom (165), at $p < 0.05$, was utilized in selecting the

value of the Studentized range statistic to be employed in making all possible pairwise comparisons using Tukey's procedure. By way of a non-technical summary, these results suggested that observed significant differences were the result of textual variations in the six selections rather than differences in genre, i.e., the three poems evoked different patterns of response, as did the three short stories.

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicated that literary response consists of four relatively independent factors moderately similar to those identified by Purves and Rippere (1968). Greater credibility, therefore, can be afforded the contention that reader response, at least as evidenced by the reactions of college undergraduates, is a distinguishable and potentially operational construct at the low-inference level. With respect to the low-inference dimensions of response, the refined instrumentation used herein produced a clearer picture of the major categories of response as represented by items on the RPI. Again, it was observed that literary response was a multidimensional construct consisting of the following four factors: personal statement, descriptive response, interpretive response, and evaluative response. Additionally, it is interesting to note that subjects' responses across all

works with respect to these four factors, revealed a preference for the categories of personal statement and interpretation. Following is a list of the five items judged to be of most value by the participants in this investigation along with the percentage of students who indicated that these questions were very important or important to their understanding of the six literary works.

1. What happens in the story/poem? Interpretive Response - Content (76.5%)

2. Is there anything in the story/poem that has a hidden meaning? Interpretive Response - Theme (70.0%)

3. What emotions does the story/poem arouse in me? Personal Statement - Affective Involvement (68.8%)

4. Does the story/poem tell me about people or ideas in general? Personal Statement - Typological (68.4%)

5. How can the way people behave in the story/poem be explained? Personal Statement - Character Behavior (66.5%)

Despite the relative success met in this phase of the investigation, further study of the constituent structure of literary response is justified. Due to the nature of the methodology employed, this investigator remains reluctant to advance the claim that a comprehensive mapping of the literary response construct has been achieved. There is, for example, an inherent limitation associated with all forms of inferentially grounded inquiry, namely the possibility that the inquiry has failed to identify all significant elements. Thus, in the present context, the

existence of some additional response behaviors that have gone undetected must be conceded. It should also be noted that this research has concentrated exclusively on the reactions of college undergraduates to six literary works. No attention has been afforded the responses that are characteristic of elementary and secondary school students. Future research using younger students and other literary selections will, no doubt, produce an even clearer description and definition of reader response.

Other findings of this study appear to contradict those of Cooper (1969), Mertz (1972), and Michalak (1976), all of whom found that high school students have a consistent way of responding to the literature they encounter. Yet, these same findings confirm those of a more recent investigation by the Education Commission of the States (National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1981) which found that textual variation does influence response. As noted by the NAEP researchers, these results "call into question the current view that what American students learn in their English classes is a particular way of responding to literature (Purves, 1981)" (NAEP, 1981, p. 38). Certainly, further research into the manner in which response varies as a function of text is needed. Research efforts which attempt to relate response to specific textual variables (e.g., form, content, point of view, etc.) hold the promise of producing a more precise picture of the nature of response.

Just as interesting is the fact that while differences in response were found to be a function of textual variation, complex relationships among response, sex, reading ability, and learning style preference were not observed. Of course, good science rarely entertains findings which are nonsignificant. Nevertheless, the failure of this study to document relationships between response and selected reader characteristics does appear to merit some attention even if it does not qualify as a scientific finding, for it offers researchers, who desire to replicate or extend this line of inquiry, many clues relative to the selection and omission of variables worthy of additional study.

References

Applebee, A. N. ERIC/RCS report: The elements of response to a literary work: What we have learned. Research in the Teaching of English, 1977, 11, 255-271.

Applebee, A. N. The child's concept of story: Ages two to seventeen. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Canfield, A. A. Learning styles inventory (Form S-A). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Humanics Media, 1976.

Cattell, R. B. The meaning and strategic use of factor analysis. In R. B. Cattell (Ed.), Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Computing Services Office. FAC. In Computing Services Office, SOUPAC program descriptions (Vol. 2). Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1976.

Cooley W. W., & Lohnes P. R. CANON: A canonical correlation program. In W. W. Cooley & P. R. Lohnes, Multivariate data analysis. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

Cooper, C. R. Preferred modes of literary response: The characteristics of high school juniors in relation to the consistency of their reactions to three dissimilar short stories (Doctoral dissertation, Univeristy of California at Berkeley, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 1680-1681A. (University Microfilms No. 70-17, 535)

Cooper, C. R., & Michalak, D. A. Notes and comments: A note on determining response styles in research on response to literature. Research in the Teaching of English, 1981, 15, 163-169.

Cummings, E. E. in Just--. In S. Dunning, E. Lueders, & H. Smith (Eds.), Reflections on a gift of watermelon pickle . . . and other modern verse. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard, 1967.

Educational Testing Service. Sequential tests of educational progress (Series II, Reading, Form 1A). Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Frost, R. "Out, Out--." In E. C. Lathem (Ed.), The poetry of Robert Frost. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1916.

Goodnight, J. H. GLM. In J. T. Helwig & K. A. Council (Eds.), SAS user's guide. Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute Inc., 1979.

Jackson, S. After you, my dear Alphonse. In S. Jackson, The lottery. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, Inc., 1943.

Kennedy, J. J. An introduction to the design and analysis of experiments in education and psychology. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

Kim, J. O., & Mueller, C. W. Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues. Sage University paper series on quantitative applications in the social sciences (Series No. 07-014). Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1978.

Mertz, M. P. Responses to literature among adolescents, English teachers, and college students: A comparative study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 6066A. (University Microfilms No. 73-10, 693)

Michalak, D. A. The effect of instruction in literature on high school students' preferred way of responding to literature (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37, 4829A. (University Microfilms No. 77-3566).

National Assessment of Educational Progress. Reading, thinking and writing: Results from the 1979-80 national assessment of reading and literature (Report No. 11-L-01). Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1981.

Parker, D. But the one on the right. In J. Moffett & K. R. McElheny (Eds.), Points of view. New York: Mentor Books, 1966.

Purves, A. C. Literature education in ten countries: An empirical study. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Purves, A. C. That sunny dome: Those caves of ice: A model for research in reader response. College English, 1979, 40, 802-812.

Purves, A. C. Reading and literature: American achievement in international perspective (Research Report No. 20). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981.

Purves, A. C., & Rippere, V. Elements of writing about a literary work: A study of response to literature (Research Report No. 9). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968.

Robinson, E. A. Richard Cory. In L. Perrine (Ed.), Sound and sense: An introduction to poetry. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Specht, D. A., & Bubolz, T. A. RELIABILITY. In C. H. Hull & N. H. Nie (Eds.), SPSS update 7-9. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Updike, J. How to love America and leave it at the same time. In J. Updike, Problems and other stories. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.

Table 1

Summary of Resultant Factors for Response Preference Inventory Data

		FACTOR I: Personal Statement					
		Factor Loadings					
Item #	Item	Jackson	Parker	Updike	Cummings	Frost	Robinson
1	Are any of the people in the story/poem like people I know?	0.574	0.534	0.545	0.433	0.505	0.515
2	How can the way people behave in the story/poem be explained?	0.376	-----	-----	-----	0.326	0.405
3	Does the story/poem succeed in getting me involved in the situation?	0.341	-----	-----	0.324	0.454	0.365
4	What does the story/poem tell me about people I know?	0.560	0.581	0.638	0.419	0.438	0.617
5	What emotions does the story/poem arouse in me?	0.518	-----	0.385	0.335	0.555	0.571
6	Does the story/poem tell me about people or ideas in general?	0.548	0.450	0.398	0.379	0.385	0.484
		FACTOR II: Descriptive Response					
		Factor Loadings					
Item #	Item	Jackson	Parker	Updike	Cummings	Frost	Robinson
7	What type of story/poem is this? Is it like any other story/poem I know?	-----	-----	-----	0.439	0.386	0.434
8	How is the story/poem structured? How is it organized?	0.548	0.514	0.460	0.458	0.559	0.505
9	How is the form, language or structure of the story/poem related to what the work is about?	0.570	0.527	0.501	0.352	0.544	0.528
10	What kinds of literary devices are used in the poem/story?	0.507	0.558	0.480	0.343	0.549	0.497
11	When was the work written? What is the historical background of the work and its author?	0.323	0.306	-----	0.314	0.378	0.321
12	Has the author used words or phrases differently from the way people usually write?	0.318	0.374	0.402	-----	0.527	0.467

		FACTOR III: Evaluative Response					
		Factor Loadings					
Item #	Item	Jackson	Parker	Updike	Cummings	Frost	Robinson
13	Is the story/poem well written?	0.618	0.537	0.478	0.473	0.549	0.584
14	Is the story/poem about important things? Is it a trivial or a serious work?	0.365	-----	-----	0.358	0.373	0.444
15	Is this a proper subject for a poem/story?	0.583	0.629	0.618	0.696	0.637	0.651

		FACTOR IV: Interpretive Response					
		Factor Loadings					
Item #	Item	Jackson	Parker	Updike	Cummings	Frost	Robinson
16	What happens in the story/poem?	0.369	0.310	0.380	0.500	-----	-----
17	Is there a lesson to be learned from the poem/story?	-----	0.399	0.436	0.656	-----	-----
18	Is there any one part of the story/poem that explains the whole work?	0.550	0.556	0.457	0.534	0.524	0.458
19	Is there anything in the story/poem that has a hidden meaning?	-----	0.475	0.325	0.464	-----	-----
20	What is the author's opinion, or attitude toward, the people in the story/poem?	-----	-----	-----	0.495	-----	-----

Table 2

Summary of Canonical Analysis Between Response Factor Scores and Sex, Reading Ability, and Selected Scores on the Learning Styles Inventory

Predictor Variables	Roots	Canonical Correlations	Squared Canonical Correlations[a]	Chi-Square	df	Probability Levels	Redundancy of Criterion Set[b]	Redundancy of Predictor Set[c]
Sex, Reading Ability, and Selected LSI Scores N = 166 (P = 19)[d]	1	0.48	0.24	90.12	76	0.250	0.055	0.016
	2	0.41	0.17	49.06	54	0.750	0.035	0.009
	3	0.30	0.09	20.39	34	0.975	0.024	0.007
	4	0.19	0.04	5.68	16	0.995	0.011	0.003
						Total	0.125	Total 0.035

[a]Squared canonical correlations provide an estimate of the strength of the relationship between linear composites of variables. For example, a squared canonical correlation of 0.24 indicates that, with respect to the principal canonical variate, 24% of the variance in canonical factor scores is shared by the predictor and the criterion variables.

[b]These measures indicate the proportion of total variance in the response (criterion) variable set that is explained by the respective sex, reading ability, LSI scores canonical factor.

[c]These measures indicate the proportion of total variance in the sex, reading ability, LSI scores (predictor) variable set that is explained by the response canonical factor.

[d]Number of scales comprising the predictor variable set.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Subjects' Reactions to the Six Forms of the Response Preference Inventory by Item and Literary Work

		Literary Works											
		Jackson		Parker		Updike		Cummings		Frost		Robinson	
Item #	Response Category	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1	Personal Statement - Association with characters	2.85	1.08	3.05	1.10	2.87	1.20	3.75	0.96	3.43	0.92	2.93	1.18
2	Personal Statement - Character behavior	1.92	0.78	2.16	0.91	2.39	0.97	3.30	1.08	2.38	0.87	2.19	0.91
3	Personal Statement - Self-involvement	2.43	0.97	2.55	1.01	2.46	1.00	3.00	1.11	2.44	0.98	2.52	0.91
4	Personal Statement - Mimetic	2.51	1.13	3.18	1.07	2.85	1.09	3.57	0.98	3.43	1.02	2.85	1.17
5	Personal Statement - Affective involvement	2.24	0.88	2.64	0.98	2.32	0.93	2.48	0.98	2.16	0.91	2.19	0.96
6	Personal Statement - Typological	1.98	0.87	2.35	0.96	2.13	0.94	2.87	1.01	2.53	1.03	2.11	0.89
7	Descriptive Response - Literary class	3.10	0.95	2.66	0.96	2.64	0.93	2.56	1.09	2.84	1.07	2.89	1.06
8	Descriptive Response - Structure	3.00	1.13	2.38	0.96	2.72	1.04	1.89	0.90	2.49	1.06	2.56	1.00
9	Descriptive Response - Relation of form to content	2.72	1.04	2.37	1.01	2.43	1.06	1.86	0.87	2.42	0.97	2.86	0.98
10	Descriptive Response - Literary devices	2.76	1.00	2.65	1.06	2.30	0.99	1.98	0.86	2.18	0.92	2.66	1.06
11	Descriptive Response - Contextual class	2.67	1.16	3.37	1.16	3.22	1.13	3.60	1.14	3.30	1.09	3.31	1.10
12	Descriptive Response - Author's use of language	3.29	0.99	2.72	0.97	2.70	1.09	2.15	1.09	2.68	1.02	3.24	0.94
13	Evaluative Response - Author's method	3.08	1.02	2.79	1.04	2.85	1.00	2.96	1.14	2.86	1.09	2.84	1.03
14	Evaluative Response - Author's vision	2.40	1.09	2.69	1.00	2.60	1.06	2.78	0.95	2.51	0.98	2.35	1.09
15	Evaluative Response - Subject appropriateness	2.93	1.19	3.43	1.04	3.23	1.19	3.28	1.13	3.17	1.23	3.24	1.14
16	Interpretive Response - Content	2.12	0.89	2.02	0.82	2.31	0.98	2.57	1.11	1.84	0.71	1.90	0.96
17	Interpretive Response - Moral	2.09	0.99	2.92	1.10	2.63	1.04	3.41	1.11	2.45	0.98	1.73	0.80
18	Interpretive Response - Part as a key to whole	2.71	0.96	2.80	1.06	2.88	0.99	2.84	1.05	2.66	1.02	2.79	1.13
19	Interpretive Response - Theme	1.83	0.84	2.51	0.97	2.39	0.95	2.34	0.96	2.24	0.91	2.34	1.03
20	Interpretive Response - Author's tone, attitude, mood	2.20	0.96	2.40	0.95	2.26	0.96	2.95	1.12	2.61	1.03	2.28	0.98

Note. Each mean and standard deviation is based on an $n = 166$ and is reported to the nearest hundredth place. The extent to which reactions approach one indicates the relative degree to which items were perceived as being very important. Conversely, the extent to which reactions approach five indicates the relative degree to which items were perceived as being very unimportant.

Table 4

Summary of Univariate ANOVA's of Items on the Response Preference Inventory by Literary Work

Item #	Response Category	Univariate *F* Tests	*p* < (df = 5/825)	*p* < (df = 1/165)[a]
1	Personal Statement - Association with characters	30.34	0.0001	0.001
2	Personal Statement - Character behavior	54.83	0.0001	0.001
3	Personal Statement - Self-involvement	11.77	0.0001	0.001
4	Personal Statement - Mimetic	34.50	0.0001	0.001
5	Personal Statement - Affective involvement	9.80	0.0001	0.01
6	Personal Statement - Typological	27.72	0.0001	0.001
7	Descriptive Response - Literary classification	9.33	0.0001	0.01
8	Descriptive Response - Structure	31.93	0.0001	0.001
9	Descriptive Response - Relation of form to content	28.43	0.0001	0.001
10	Descriptive Response - Literary devices	22.97	0.0001	0.001
11	Descriptive Response - Contextual class	22.04	0.0001	0.001
12	Descriptive Response - Author's use of language	37.37	0.0001	0.001
13	Evaluative Response - Author's method	3.45	(.0045	-----
14	Evaluative Response - Author's vision	6.58	0.0001	0.05
15	Evaluative Response - Subject appropriateness	7.52	0.0001	0.01
16	Interpretive Response - Content	21.62	0.0001	0.001
17	Interpretive Response - Moral	76.40	0.0001	0.001
18	Interpretive Response - Part as a key to whole	1.58	0.16	-----
19	Interpretive Response - Theme	14.16	0.0001	0.001
20	Interpretive Response - Author's tone, attitude, mood	17.20	0.0001	0.001

[a]Level of significance for Geisser-Greenhouse conservative *F* test using reduced degrees of freedom.